

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Josef Dietl  
Serial No. : 10/698,059  
Filed : October 29, 2003  
Title : SELECTING A RENDERER

Art Unit : 2153  
Examiner : Unknown

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF PRIORITY DOCUMENT UNDER 35 USC §119

The applicant hereby confirms his claim of priority under 35 USC §119 from the following application(s):


·European Patent Convention Application No. 02024435.6 filed October 29, 2002

A certified copy of each application from which priority is claimed is submitted herewith.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-16-04

  
Elissa Y. Wang  
Reg. No. 48,668


Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50231027.doc

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

AUGUST 16, 2004  
Date of Deposit

  
Signature

EMMA DURICK  
Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)



P.B. 5818 - Patentlaan 2  
2280 HV Rijswijk (ZH)  
☎ +31 70 340 2040  
TX 31651 epo nl  
FAX +31 70 340 3016

Europäisches  
Patentamt

European  
Patent Office

Office européen  
des brevets

Generaldirektion 1

Directorate General 1

Direction Générale 1

SAP Aktiengesellschaft  
Neurottstrasse 16  
69190 Walldorf  
DE

Datum/Date

28/05/04

Zeichen/Ref./Réf. <b>2002P10023 EP</b>	Anmeldung Nr./Application No./Demande n°/Patent Nr./Patent No./Brevet n°. <b>02024435.6 2201 1416397</b>
Anmelder/Applicant/Demandeur/Patentinhaber/Proprietor/Titulaire <b>SAP Aktiengesellschaft</b>	

**Übersendung von/Transmission of/Envoi de**

Antrag vom/Request dated/Requête du 19/05/04

- ☐ Kopien bei Akteneinsicht nach Regel 94(3) EPÜ  
Copies in the case of inspection of files pursuant to Rule 94(3) EPC  
Copies en cas d'inspection publique selon la règle 94(3) CBE
- ☐ Beglaubigung  
Certification  
Certification
- ☒ 1 Prioritätsbeleg(e)/priority document(s)/document(s) de priorité R. 94(4)
- ☐ ———— Ausfertigung(en) der Patenturkunde nach Regel 54(2) EPÜ  
Duplicate of the patent certificate pursuant to Rule 54(2) EPC  
Duplicata du certificat de brevet, selon la Règle 54(2) CBE
- ☐ Auszug aus dem Register nach Regel 92(3) EPÜ  
Extract from the register pursuant to Rule 92(3) EPC  
Extrait du registre selon la Règle 92(3) CBE
- ☐ Auskunft aus den Akten nach Regel 95 EPÜ  
Communication of information contained in the files pursuant to Rule 95 EPC  
Communication d'informations contenues dans la dossier selon la Règle 95 CBE
- ☐ Akteneinsicht nach Regel 94(2) EPÜ  
Inspection of files pursuant to Rule 94(2) EPC  
Inspection publique selon la Règle 94(2) CBE

PERON L (TEL:3632)

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**



**Europäisches  
Patentamt**

**European  
Patent Office**

**Office européen  
des brevets**

**Bescheinigung**

**Certificate**

**Attestation**

Die angehefteten Unterlagen stimmen mit der ursprünglich eingereichten Fassung der auf dem nächsten Blatt bezeichneten europäischen Patentanmeldung überein.

The attached documents are exact copies of the European patent application described on the following page, as originally filed.

Les documents fixés à cette attestation sont conformes à la version initialement déposée de la demande de brevet européen spécifiée à la page suivante.

**Patentanmeldung Nr.    Patent application No.    Demande de brevet n°**

02024435.6

Der Präsident des Europäischen Patentamts;  
Im Auftrag

For the President of the European Patent Office

Le Président de l'Office européen des brevets  
p.o.

**R C van Dijk**

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**



Anmeldung Nr:  
Application no.: 02024435.6  
Demande no:

Anmeldetag:  
Date of filing: 29.10.02  
Date de dépôt:

Anmelder/Applicant(s)/Demandeur(s):

SAP Aktiengesellschaft  
Neurottstrasse 16  
69190 Walldorf  
ALLEMAGNE

Bezeichnung der Erfindung/Title of the invention/Titre de l'invention:  
(Falls die Bezeichnung der Erfindung nicht angegeben ist, siehe Beschreibung.  
If no title is shown please refer to the description.  
Si aucun titre n'est indiqué se référer à la description.)

Scoring algorithm

In Anspruch genommene Priorität(en) / Priority(ies) claimed /Priorité(s)  
revendiquée(s)  
Staat/Tag/Aktenzeichen/State/Date/File no./Pays/Date/Numéro de dépôt:

Internationale Patentklassifikation/International Patent Classification/  
Classification internationale des brevets:

G06F17/30

Am Anmeldetag benannte Vertragsstaaten/Contracting states designated at date of  
filing/Etats contractants désignées lors du dépôt:

AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE DK EE ES FI FR GB GR IE IT LI LU MC NL PT SE SK TR

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**



## SCORING ALGORITHM

29. Okt. 2002

5 The invention can relate to a computer-implemented method for selecting a renderer.

10 Within a web-based client server computer system, a client accesses a web application on a server using a browser. Over the http protocol the browser sends a parameter called "user agent" in the http header of every request to identify the type of browser for the server. This identification of the browser is used by the server to correctly render the HTML code such that that specific browser can display the information  
15 correctly. The "user agent" header is then mapped to a static table to choose the specific renderer, or mapped to a static table of individual properties for the required specific output methods.

20 These tables are large, with at present typically more than 100 properties listing bugs (e.g. certain cell phones do not recognize title tags) or specific features of each browser and their release for each possible browser (e.g. Netscape 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, Internet  
25 Explorer 5.0, 5.1, 6.0 etc.). Due to the steadily increasing number of different browsers in use, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain an effective list with all known browsers. It is even more costly to provide for a specific renderer for each browser; in  
30 particular as with almost every new release or bug fix for a specific browser a new renderer is required.

It is an object of the invention to provide a method that more efficiently identifies a renderer matching a  
35 specific browser for the server. To achieve this goal the invention provides for a method according to claim 1. By selecting a browser based on a selection

criterion, a good renderer can be selected for each client, without the need for constant maintenance to insure the correct functioning of the server, and without the need to provide for a specific renderer for every browser in use.

Further embodiments of the invention are the subject of the dependent claims.

Further objects, aspects and advantages of the invention will be better understood from the following detailed description of a preferred embodiment of the invention with reference to the drawing, in which:

Fig. 1 shows schematically an example of an embodiment of the invention,

Fig. 2 shows schematically an example of a flow chart of an embodiment of the invention.

In various embodiments of the invention, a computer system is provided. In one example, the computer system is embodied as a server computer 10. Server computers or servers are per se known in the art, and are used to supply client computers with information, for example in the form of web pages. The server 10 has a processing section 30, and a memory section 40. In the memory section 40, web page information 20 is stored, as well as a plurality of renderers 50. A renderer is a computer application, stored in the form of a computer program, that when processed by the processing section, prepares web page information such that it can be interpreted by a browser run on a client computer. The renderers 50 are each different in that they each prepare the web information according to a specific standard. Each of the renderers 50 is associated with at least one identifier in the form of a browser template 60. The respective browser templates 60 are stored in a table 70 in the memory section 40.

A browser template can for example be expressed in the form of a string such as for example:

"Mozilla/5.0 (\*) \* Netscape6/\*",  
 5 "Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:0.9.4.1) Gecko/20020508 Netscape6/6.2.3", wherein  
 "\*" signifies a wildcard character.

In the first example the string indicates that the  
 10 associated renderer is capable to render web pages for use for a series of releases, in this example all Netscape browsers of the 6 series release. In the second example the associated renderer is capable to render web pages specific release, in this case  
 15 Netscape 6/6.2.3. The invention is not limited to the two examples mentioned; according to the invention any browser or browser type or series can be named in the browser template.

20 In use, the server 10 receive from a client computer that connects with the server an identifier for the browser that the client computer is currently using, for example a user agent identifier in the http header which identifies the browser, see step 308 in Fig. 2.

25 The server 10 is further provided with a scoring application. The scoring application is in this example embodied in a computer program that is stored in the memory section 40. The application can be embodied for  
 30 example in a stand-alone computer program product, a programming module, any unit of computer programming, programmed logic, and in any other suitable form. The scoring application can be executed by the server 10. When executed by the server, the scoring application  
 35 compares the user agent ("UA") string with the browser template strings contained in the table 70, see step 328 in Fig. 2. The scoring application determines a

score for each comparison made between the user agent string and a browser template, wherein the score reflects the similarity between both strings. For example a higher score can indicate a better match or conformity, and a lower score can indicate a lesser match or conformity. Based on the determined scores, one of the browser templates is selected (see step 348 in Fig. 2), and the renderer that corresponds with the selected template is used in communication with that specific browser.

The template can for example be selected on basis of the highest score among all templates compared, or for example be the first score that matches or exceeds a predetermined minimum value of the score. In the latter example of a selection method, the selection process can proceed faster under certain conditions. In another embodiment of the invention, the selection process can be performed such that only a maximum score, i.e. a complete match, leads to a direct selection of a browser template, and if no template is directly selected a default (predetermined) browser template (and corresponding renderer) is chosen.

In one example of an embodiment or example the user agent string "Netscape 6.03" is transmitted by a client, the string being described in the example using simplified UA strings. In one embodiment of the invention the score can be for example be computed as the number of matching characters in a template (excluding the wildcards) divided by number of characters of the UA string. The comparison with a first browser template "Netscape 6.03" would for example deliver a score of 1 (or 100%), as all characters of the string match. The comparison with a second browser template "Netscape 6\*" delivers a score of 10/13 (or 77%) as only 10 characters of the template

fit in with the user agent string having in total 13 characters. Therefore the browser template "Netscape 6.03" would be selected by the scoring application.

5 In a further example the score of the user agent string "Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 5.5; Windows NT 5.0)" is compared with a first template "Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE \*; Windows NT \*)" is  $44/50 = 0,88$  (or 88%).

10

In an even further example the score of the user agent string "Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 5.5; Windows NT 5.0)" relative to respectively a second template "Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 5.5; Windows NT \*)" and  
15 a third template "Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE \*; Windows NT 5.0)" is for both cases 0.94 or (94%).

20 Preferably, a selection should be made in one or two evaluation steps or less. If a tied score occurs, in one example of an embodiment of the invention any renderer with the maximum score can be chosen.

25 By selecting a browser based on a selection criterion, while assuming that similar user agent strings require similar browsers, a good renderer can be selected for each client, without the need for constant maintenance to insure the correct functioning of the server, and without the need to provide for a specific renderer for  
30 every browser in use.

The invention further relates to a program storage device readable by a computer system, embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer  
35 system to perform any method according to the invention. As this invention may be embodied in several forms without departing from the spirit of essential

characteristics thereof, the present embodiment is therefore illustrative and not restrictive, since the scope of the invention is defined by the appended claims rather than by the description preceding them, 5 and all changes that fall within the metes and bounds of the claims, or equivalence of such metes and bounds thereof are therefore intended to be embraced by the claims.

Claims

29. Okt. 2002

1. Computer implemented method for selecting a  
renderer, comprising  
5 receiving a browser identification in the form of  
a user agent string from a client browser (308),  
comparing said user agent string with at least two  
browser templates using a scoring application  
(328), wherein said scoring application determines  
10 a score for a comparison made between the user  
agent string and a browser template, wherein said  
score reflects the similarity between said user  
agent string and said respective browser template,  
and  
15 selecting based on a result from said comparison a  
renderer for use in communication with said client  
browser (348).
2. Method according to claim 1, wherein the scoring  
20 application determines said score by computing a  
number of matching characters in a browser  
template divided by a number of characters in the  
user agent string.
- 25 3. Method according to claim 1 or 2, comprising  
selecting a renderer based on a maximum score  
determined by said scoring application.
- 30 4. Method according to claim 1, comprising selecting  
a renderer based on a first score that matches a  
predetermined minimum value of the score  
determined by the scoring application.
- 35 5. Method according to any of the preceding claims,  
wherein the selection comprises selecting a  
renderer from among a plurality of renderers.

6. Program storage device readable by a computer system, embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer system to perform a method according to any of claims 1-4.

5



AbstractEPO - Munich  
55

29. Okt. 2002

Computer implemented method for selecting a renderer,  
comprising

5 receiving a browser identification in the form of a  
user agent string from a client browser, comparing  
the user agent string with browser templates using a  
scoring application, wherein the scoring application  
determines a score for a comparison made between the  
10 user agent string and a browser template, wherein the  
score reflects the similarity between said user agent  
string and the respective browser template, and  
selecting based on a result from the comparison a  
renderer for use in communication with the client  
15 browser, wherein the scoring application determines  
the score by computing a number of matching  
characters in a browser template divided by a number  
of characters in the user agent string.

20

Fig. 1

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**

EPO - Munich  
55

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

29. Okt. 2002




Fig. 1




Fig. 2